Pam.
Misc.
1631

Scottish National Council, Y.M.C.A.

MODEL SYLLABUS SERIES NO. 4

THE CHRISTIAN CITIZEN AND INTERNATIONAL QUESTIONS.

1. PRINCIPLES.

Aim :—To discover fundamental principles of the Gospel applicable to international relations.

Has the Christian as such any concern with the relations between nations? If he has obligations to the community in which he lives, has he not similar obligations to the world-community of which it is a member? In these days every large business house has connections all over the globe. The highways of the world are thronged by men of every nation, on pleasure or business bent. Our greater cities bring many of us into almost daily contact with men of other races. Is it sufficient to say that the Christian's obligations are fulfilled by carrying the spirit of Jesus into these ordinary everyday relations with other men? Or that his brotherly duty is completely satisfied by the support of Christian missions in other lands? All the time the government which represents him is having dealings with the governments of these other peoples; and just these everyday relations of business, of travel, of missions are conditioned by the acts of governments. The extreme case occurs when war is declared by one government on another, rupturing abruptly all those ties which bind the different members of the human family. The Christian has vital concern with these things. With his ideal of a human brotherhood, acknowledging one God and Father,

he cannot but see in the mingling of races following on the development of communications, and the consequent breaking down of barriers which from the beginning of time have divided peoples, the conditions which make possible the fulfilment of his dream. Yet again this very mingling of peoples of the most diverse habits seems to contain all the elements of strife and chaos. Which shall prevail? All are agreed that goodwill between nations is an essential condition of the solution of problems of national and racial relations. With goodwill, the solving of these problems becomes a glorious adventure; without it life would seem a fevered nightmare on the brink of Armageddon.

Questions for Discussion:—

1. What was Jesus' attitude to the government of His day? Did he recognise it as having any authority over Him, and if so, to what extent? (Consider Matt. xvii. 24-27, and similar passages).
2. Read Luke xxii. 24-26. Does this principle of service apply to nations as to individuals? What constitutes greatness in a nation?
3. (*a*) Consider the suggestion that "God made some races to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for the others."
   Can you find anything in the Gospels to justify or condemn this statement? (Compare Joshua ix. with Isaiah ii. 2-4, and Rom. xi., 1 Cor. xii. 12-26.)
   (*b*) Is the aboriginal of Central Africa in any sense the equal of the white man?
4. (*a*) For a long time the Japanese prohibited the entry of foreign missions, along with other foreign influences, on the ground that Christianity would involve the obliteration of their national distinctions, of which they were proud. Was their argument a sound one? (John viii. 12; Matt. v.)
   (*b*) Did Jesus expect the Kingdom of God to be estab-

lished throughout the entire world? Would this mean the disappearance of national characteristics?

---

2. TRADE RELATIONS.

Aim:—To consider how much nations are dependent on each other for the raw material of industry, and even for the means of livelihood; and what the development of this interchange of commodities may lead to.

In nothing to-day is the inter-relation of the nations more manifest than in the economic sphere. The war has made this sufficiently clear to us. The whole world contributes to our breakfast table. Blockade of supplies is found to be the most effective weapon that a league of nations can exercise on an offending member. It is true that nations may produce food enough for themselves, of a kind, as they have done in the past. But there are parts of the world that produce certain staple foods infinitely better and in larger quantity than others, and a return to a state of self-sufficiency would seem to be wasteful of human energy. When we come to other requisites of modern civilisation, like rubber and oil, any attempt at self-sufficiency is obviously out of the question. The conditions of labour in other countries, therefore, must always materially affect us. Egypt and India produce our cotton; parts of Africa provide palm-oil and rubber; we depend on America, India and Russia for wheat; and these are only examples. A rise in the standard of life in these countries, meaning higher wages, may automatically effect serious change in ours. Again, if we desire to prevent exploitation of labour at home, we should be equally interested in preventing it abroad, so far as we can, among those who also minister to our comfort. If there is widespread discontent anywhere in the world, our own material interests alone require that it be allayed. But if we hold that a man anywhere is of more value than the product

of his labour, it is emphatically our business as Christians to ensure, so far as in us lies, that his service of us does not rob him of his birthright of a good life, wherever he lives or whatever his colour.

Questions for Discussion (see A2, 3, B1, C1, 2, D4, 5):—

1. (*a*) Give instances of commodities produced in a few countries, the lack of which would seriously hamper the development of others.
   Under what circumstances, if any, would a nation be justified in withholding or restricting supplies of these to other nations?
   (*b*) Discuss how much the proximity of coal and iron have meant to the supremacy of Britain and Germany in modern times. (*Cf.* Keynes, "The Economic Consequences of the Peace.")
2. (*a*) Some people are reluctant to consider the possibility of Britain ceasing to govern India because they believe it would be bad for British trade. Would it be bad for trade? And if so, is that our chief motive in governing India?
   (*b*) It is said that Britain desired the mandate for Mesopotamia largely because she wished to control the oil-fields there. If this were the case, could you justify her action in pressing for the mandate?
3. (*a*) Is a nation justified under any circumstances in compelling native peoples in tropical territories to work for the development of the products of their country? (*Cf.* the article on "Labour Conditions in Africa" in the *International Review of Missions* for October 1920. One member might procure copies of recent regulations of the East African Government, and the facts embodied in the Bishop of Zanzibar's pamphlet. See also "Africa —Slave or Free," by Harris.)
   (*b*) Are the rates of wages and conditions of labour, say, in Japan any business of the British people? How could we secure any change in them?

4. Is the sufficiency of each nation or empire to itself in food or other material a satisfactory ideal? (One member might read the General Principles of the International Labour Convention, being Part XIII. of the Treaty of Versailles. Another might bring a summarised report of the consequent meeting of the International Labour Conference at Washington in 1919.)
5. At the present moment (September 1920) France and Italy are paying for a ton of British coal more than twice what the British consumer pays. Can you explain why this is, and justify it from the standpoint of the brotherhood of nations?
6. What changes in international trade relations would follow if the principles discovered in Study I. were carried out?

---

3. INTELLECTUAL AND SPIRITUAL BONDS.

Aim:—To consider the extent to which intellectual and spiritual influences transcend national divisions.

It is a commonplace to say that the works of men like Shakespeare, Dante, Homer are the possession of the whole world. That is becoming literally true of the classics of every nation. Yet it is possible to under-estimate considerably the extent to which men of learning and culture, during their lifetime, influence those of other countries. The things of the intellect and the spirit transcend national and racial divisions. Tolstoi, Ibsen, Wagner, Mendelssohn, Kant, Bergson, Pasteur, Newton, to take a few names, are known throughout Europe. Tagore, an Indian, is given by European hands the Nobel prize for the outstanding literary production of the year. A humble scientist in Calcutta—Bose—makes original discoveries in plant life, and becomes the honoured guest of the Royal Society in London. In the Middle Ages all Europe was a university whose

travelling scholars made their friendships and compared their discoveries with little regard to the wars that waged. So, to-day, by means of the journals of learned societies, and the publishing of books, even more than by such visits, the new discovery of any original worker becomes at once the possession of the whole world of scientists, to be tested, criticised, modified, and finally applied to the well-being of mankind, and to be the basis for further advance. The vast improvement of communications, however, has only made more acute one difficulty—that of language. In the Middle Ages a knowledge of Latin sufficed to introduce the scholar to all the culture of Europe. To-day ability to read French, German and English is a practically indispensable condition of entry to this wider world ; and even then the rich modern literature of India, China and Japan remains a sealed book.

Another notable feature of comparatively recent development is the variety and number of international conferences that are held annually, not only of governments and of learned societies, but of trades-unionists, financiers, philatelists—in fact, of those associated with every kind of interest that is not limited to one nation. Especially noteworthy are those of philanthropic associations, most of all the Christian Church. In many cases permanent organisations have been formed to promote such conferences at regular intervals. These organisations naturally tend to develop a continual co-ordinating influence, and to become permanent international links. Here again the common interests of mankind continually overleap national barriers, even the language difficulty being overcome by more or less satisfactory expedients.

In a less direct but perhaps more permanent way, there is a constant flow of ideas and culture through the numbers of individuals who live in another land than their own. Some few at least of those who reside abroad for long or short periods, for trade or other reasons, interest themselves

in the peoples among whom they live, and make friends among them. If this is usually confined to the rarer spirits, their influence is likely to be of the best. Especially is this important in India and China. More noteworthy still is the extent to which students from every nation frequent the leading universities of the world. In 1919-20 over thirty nationalities were represented in Edinburgh University, and nearly one-sixth of its 4000 students came from outside Britain ; this in a year when the world's communications were seriously disarranged. London University is still more cosmopolitan, and the same is true of Paris, Lausanne, Berlin, and the larger universities of America. A considerable and increasing number of these students come from China, Japan and India. The reverse tide has not yet set in. Is the day far distant when the wise men and literary treasures of the East will attract Western students to the developing universities of China and India, as Florence and Paris did in the great days of the Renaissance? In these ways habits of friendship and understanding may be formed which augur well for the world's peace. It is true that an effect, temporary it may be, though powerful, of a few years in Europe on many Eastern students is to lessen their admiration of Western ways and civilisation. But in the long run continual contact makes for better understanding, and is not misunderstanding at the root of most of the world's quarrels?

But probably the greatest direct international force in things of the intellect and spirit is that of the Christian Church. There have been other missionary religions, like Buddhism and Mohammedanism. The latter is still indeed the most rapidly expanding religion in Africa. Yet the freeing of the intellect is essentially a characteristic of Christianity. It is Christian missions that by the founding of schools and colleges have opened to the people of Eastern lands not only the stores of Western knowledge but the treasures of their own heritage. In Europe the

Church, sole sanctuary of the scholar for many centuries, still exercises wide influence through its international connections.

Questions for Discussion (C1):—

1. "To know a man you must live with him." Consider the prospects of a better understanding between (*a*) the nations of Europe; (*b*) East and West, through increased facilities for travel.
2. (*a*) If you were a student of China or India, resident for a time in Scotland, what attitude to Christianity would be likely to characterise you on your return to your native land.
   (*b*) What are the advantages and disadvantages of Indian students attending British universities? How can the disadvantages be removed?
3. Is it characteristic of Scottish people to be willing to learn from those of other nations and races? (Some member of the group might study and report on what Scotland gained through her sixteenth century connection with France.)
4. Compare the respective value of Christian Missions and international trade in fostering goodwill among the nations.
5. What other ways can you suggest for facilitating the understanding of nations by each other? (Esperanto? More international conferences? etc., etc.)
6. Do all religions make for international goodwill? Consider which religions may be called national, and which international.
   (Some member might compare the propagation of Islam by the sword and the setting up of an Islamic empire, with the ideals of Islam. Another might compare the motive of the Crusades, and the idea of the Holy Roman Empire, with the ideals of Christianity. A third might report on the national religion of Japan.) (See Wells' "Outline of History" on Mohammedanism and the Crusades.)

4. POLITICAL.

Aim :—To consider the actual political relations of nations, the ideal relations, and practical means of achieving them.

One outstanding feature of the period we live in is change in forms of government and the setting up of new groups or states. In Europe many thrones have disappeared, and there is hardly a country where the form of government has not been completely changed or at least is being considerably modified. The war has upset the old balance, and hastened processes already at work in various countries. The spirit of democracy is abroad and clamours for open recognition, not only in the states of Europe, but in the older civilisations of China, Japan, India, Egypt, and even among the peoples of Africa. There is a widespread demand for "self-determination," an assertion by various groups of a national identity, hitherto little realised. These groups are not always united geographically. At the same time a practical effort is being made, inspired by a general desire, or at least a fear of the alternative, to establish a Council of the Nations, whereby co-operation and not domination shall be the keynote of interstate relations. (It should be noted here that the words "state" and "nation" do not necessarily mean the same thing. The question as to what constitutes a nation raises considerations of race, language, history, traditions, religion, and group psychology of the most complicated kind.) Suffice that the ideal of the League of Nations contemplates a community of states, each self-organised and self-contained, co-operating as equals to set up a reign of law in international affairs, and to secure the development of the more backward races for their adequate part in the commonwealth of the world. The mere acceptance of this ideal by the majority of states in the world to-day, and the initiation of steps to its

fulfilment, constitute a most remarkable step in political evolution. It is generally recognised, however, that the execution of the idea involves the most intricate and delicate problems, in which national feeling as well as sectional interests are deeply concerned. Only a settled determination on the part of the peoples concerned to secure the reign of law at whatever cost of individual sacrifice will enable these difficulties to be surmounted.

Questions for Discussion (see A1, D1, 3, 7):—

1. Does it matter to the Christian what sort of government a nation has? Is democracy the only Christian form of government?
2. Can you justify the government of one nation by another, and if so, what should be the aim of the ruling nation?
3. What constitutes a nation? Are the Jews a nation? Is Switzerland?
4. What principles ought to govern a nation in its relations with another? Should the welfare of its own subjects be the government's sole consideration, even at the expense of others?
5. Are the same principles applicable between nations as between individuals? Do the nations recognise that they are subject to the same moral laws as an individual? Should they?
6. Discuss the difference between self-determination and self-assertion.
7. Is a government justified in refusing missionaries of religion (*e.g.* Germans, Mormons) access to its subjects? If so, on what grounds?
8. Is a League of Nations a Christian ideal? Does it sum up for you the ideal kind of government for a world of Christian peoples? Do you expect it to work in a world only partly Christian? (*Cf.* the ideal of a Family of Nations.)

5. BACKWARD PEOPLES.

Aim:—To consider the relations of more advanced to more backward peoples, and what motives should inspire them.

It is important that before calling a nation backward we should assure ourselves that we are not mistaking development on different lines for backwardness. Is it possible, for instance, that the Indians or Chinese, who lack the most prized characteristics of our Western civilisation, may in some ways be nearer an ideal life than we are? It is a common experience to hear all men of different colour and habits from ourselves classed as "niggers" or despised as "foreigners." Is it because they do not at once admit the superiority of our ways by slavishly copying them? May "backwardness" not be backwardness only in material development, and be accompanied by a deeper insight, a "forwardness" in the things of the intellect and spirit, which we others may be hardly able to appreciate, and therefore the last to admit? Especially in the case of India and China it is well to remember that they were weary of knowledge while our forefathers were yet savages.

Yet there are aboriginal races, like most of the negro tribes of Africa, which are obviously still in a very primitive state. Their reasoning faculties are comparatively undeveloped, although the abnormal acuteness of some of their senses, developed by their life as hunters, etc., may give us a sense of something lost. Into their land the white man, and as in South Africa, the Indian also, penetrates. Before his superior skill in the practical details of living, as well as in intellect, the negro tends to be overwhelmed, his simple ways—some of them doubtless horrible, but not all—to be destroyed, and he himself, in his inability to live on a new standard, either to become a serf or to die out, helped by the acquisition of unaccustomed vices. On the other hand, living among people of a lower standard of morality is often

demoralising to a white community, where it is small in numbers. Again, the negro may be lazy; is the white man justified in compelling him to work for his own good, as a child is put under discipline? Or is he to be given the same rights as are enjoyed by the members of a more highly civilised community? In other words, in the name of human equality is the white man to endure the society of people of habits that fill him with disgust and even nausea? Or is the native to be a hewer of wood and drawer of water to the superior races? For how long? To the end of time?

If he is given the privilege of education, it is argued again, his new-found knowledge may enable him to use his superior numbers to drive out the white man. Or he may even enter the white man's country, and with his lower standard of living and needs drive the white working man from his own labour market, as the European has tried to prevent him doing on the Rand. Should he be permitted to go in the world where he likes; and if he is restricted, why not our own "hooligans"? Questions like these are pressing to-day, and it is urgent to discover the principles on which they must be resolved, if partial remedies are not to produce a worse state of affairs.

Questions for Discussion (see C1, 2, D6):—

1. "Wherever the white man goes he is a destroying force." Contrast this statement of Viscount Bryce with the other, "As soon as the negro meets the white man his education has begun." Can both be true, and in what senses?
2. What is the reason for colour prejudice? Is it inevitable? Are the differences between Chinese and British (or between Indian and Negro) fundamental, or are men fundamentally the same in their needs, capacities, and ideals throughout the world.
3. A bill presented to the South African Parliament by

General Smuts proposes that 40,000,000 acres of land shall be set apart for natives and 260,000,000 acres for whites. The natives number 4,000,000 and the whites 1,100,000. Is this a fair proposal? (See "Africa—Slave or Free.")

4. What do the words "yellow peril" convey to you? Do you agree that there is such a peril, and what effective means are there, if any, of meeting it?
(See also Question 3 of Study II.)

---

6. CONFLICT OF LOYALTIES.

Aim:—To consider whether world-brotherhood is compatible with loyalty to one's own state.

The foregoing studies must have revealed the likelihood of instances occurring where an individual's loyalty to his country is seriously at variance with his sense of obligation to the rest of humanity. Recognising the value of patriotism, and the discipline of loyalty, moved by a real love of his country, and perhaps conscious that her leaders may see further into the issues at stake than he does, he may yet feel that the issue for him is between loyalty to a League of Nations, standing for a still unrealised world brotherhood, and loyalty to his country. We are not here dealing with those cases where a man feels that a fundamental principle of conduct is at stake, and his conscience, not fully lightened perhaps, but still his, forbids him following his country's lead at the cost of his sincerity. Of these the late war provides an obvious example. But we are considering the case where it is difficult to see clearly, where practical common sense seems to point one way and an ideal which seems hardly practicable another; such a choice, for instance, as may be said to present itself to an American citizen in this year (1920) as between the best interests of his nation, which *may* be for the best good of the world, and the rather indefinite League of Nations, set up by the Treaty of

Versailles. What considerations should guide him in his choice?

Is there a real issue between nationalism and internationalism? We are familiar with the idea of submitting to the conditions and restraints of a larger society in return for the mutual benefits of living in such a society. We sacrifice some of our liberties for a wider gain. In a League of Nations, if it is more than a name, obviously the members must consent to some curtailment of their freedom of action. This curtailment is likely to be greatest in the cases of the most powerful nations. Some ideals of imperialism may have to go by the board, and they may not all be unworthy. But if a nation is conscious of a mission in the world, of being animated by high ideals, and of the power to exercise these, is she right to submit to the control of representatives of other peoples whose ideals may not be so high?

Questions for Discussion (see D2, 3, 7):—

1. Under what circumstances, if any, would Britain be justified in refusing to accept a decision of the League of Nations?
2. Is India entitled to self-government if a majority of the population desire it, even if the League of Nations and the British Government agree that it is inadvisable?
3. What national distinctions are bound to disappear in the end by the development of the League of Nations idea? What will remain?
4. Enumerate specific sovereign powers which Britain has given up in joining the present League of Nations, and discuss others which it is right that she, in common with other nations, should submit to the guidance of the League. What kind of affairs should remain wholly in her own control?
5. Do you think that Britain would reduce her navy, or abandon any of her Empire, at the bidding of the League of Nations? (Consider what the action of the

popular press would likely be if such a demand were made.)

6. Many Moslems in India own a double allegiance, to the Sultan of Turkey as titular head of their religion and to King George as Emperor of India? Are these ever likely to conflict?

(Some member might study the present agitation in India about the Khalifate and report on the issues involved.)

---

7. INDIVIDUAL ACTION.

A Christian has an international religion. He belongs to a fellowship that knows no distinctions of race or nationality. He feels the obligation, or, rather, the love of Christ constrains him, to extend its Gospel to all without distinction. He believes that it will satisfy the best in every man, woman and child throughout the world, and his first aim in life is so to make it understood. Further, he has a goal, "a city of God," to which all the nations of the world contribute their treasures. He prays that the reign of God may come to pass on earth as it is in the heavens.

Withal he is a citizen in a community of ordinary men, with duties to that community, not all of his own devising, and through it to the other nations of the world. He is conscious of many problems. Not only through his vote, but in every opinion he is called on to express, he is making his contribution on one side or another to actual decisions on these questions. He cannot absolve himself even if he would.

Some choices he makes are more deliberate than others—the casting of his vote on some urgent question, the decision as to the causes he will support, how much support he can and will give, the choice of his life-work, the use of his leisure. On these decisions great issues hang.

As a reasonable man he is convinced that without good-will no satisfactory solution of the world's problems is

possible. As a Christian he knows that goodwill has only one source, in the realisation of the Fatherhood of God and the essential brotherhood of man, revealed in Christ. He knows, in fine, that there is no peace for the world or for himself till the meek and lowly Jesus is enthroned in the hearts of men. Do you not then expect to find all his interests, energies, and thoughts focussed on how to achieve this?

This involves some knowledge of these other peoples, a living sympathy with them, a realisation of their point of view or at least of the fact that they have a point of view, a willingness to sink his own opinions, a distrust even of his own theology, if only they catch the spirit of His Master and follow Him. Especially does it mean living a life that expresses the spirit he would impart. He knows full well the truth of Kipling's lines:

> "By all ye cry or whisper,
> By all ye leave or do,
> The silent, sullen peoples
> Shall weigh your gods and you."
> ("The White Man's Burden.")

If a man have the spirit of goodwill to all men burning clear in him there is no force on earth that can long withstand it.

Questions for Discussion (C1):—

1. "Is each man's religion good enough for him?" Is Hinduism good enough for the educated Indian? Is Animism good enough for the negro? Would you be content always to see Moslems on the Council of the League of Nations?
2. Can a man be a Christian and withhold his fullest support from (*a*) Foreign Missions, (*b*) the Church? What limits should there be to such support? Discuss the respective value of various means of support.
3. Discuss the practical effects on international affairs of

Foreign Missions in (*a*) China, (*b*) India, (*c*) South Africa, (*d*) Great Britain.

4. In what practical ways can (*a*) a miner, (*b*) a marine engineer, (*c*) a traveller, (*d*) a clerk in a business house with foreign connections, (*e*) a school teacher, (*f*) an Indian Government officer, help the promotion of goodwill among peoples? (*E.g.* Consider what support a miner would get in his Union if he moved that the price of coal should be reduced for Central Europe as well as for the home consumer.)

5. Let each member of the group consider and report on

(*a*) How far his work brings him into contact with any other country, and how far such intercourse is of service to that country.

(*b*) What acquaintances he has in other countries. (The group might sum up how much of the world they cover in this way, and consider how they can acquire more accurate knowledge of the world thus by each member keeping a scrap-book for some country, and reading about it.)

(*c*) Can the group as such do anything to help in its leisure time?

(*d*) Does the group contribute to any body that affects the welfare of other peoples? What definite steps can they take to find out how it is spent?

(*e*) What opportunities they have in voting or conversation of affecting the life of other peoples. Can the group do anything to spread a knowledge of important facts?

(*f*) Does the group think that prayer for the welfare of India, or for individuals in India, does any good in India?

NOTE ON LITERATURE

Especially since the war, a large number of books have been published dealing with special aspects of various international questions. No reference is given to any of these here; but most of the books recommended below contain their own bibliography for those who wish to pursue any subject further.

Some publications are, however, quite indispensable to groups discussing these questions. The price of the following places them within the reach of all.

			S.	D.
*	A.	1. "The Covenant of the League of Nations," with Commentary—H.M. Stationery Office	0	2
*		2. "Labour and the Peace Treaty," including Part XIII. of the Treaty of Versailles (The International Labour Convention)—H.M. Stationery Office	0	1
*		3. "The International Labour Conference, 1919"—H.M. Stationery Office	0	2
	B.	1. Memoranda on International Labour Legislation, Sidney Webb—Labour Party	1	0
*	C.	1. "Social Problems and the East"—Lenwood—Student Christian Movement	2	6
		2. "Africa—Slave or Free"—J. H. Harris	3	0
	D.	1. "The Covenant Explained"—League of Nations Union	1	0
		2. "The League and its Guarantees"—Prof. Gilbert Murray—League of Nations Union	1	0
		3. "The League in the East"—Prof. A. J. Toynbee—League of Nations Union	1	0
		4. "The League and Labour"—C. Delisle Burns—League of Nations Union	1	0
		5. "The Economic Functions of the League"—N. Angell—League of Nations Union	1	0
		6. "Mandates and Empire"—Leonard Wolff—League of Nations Union	1	0
		7. "The Future of the Covenant"—G. Lowes Dickenson—League of Nations Union	1	0

The above are referred to in the text by letter and number.

There are several valuable volumes in the Home University Library at 2s. each, *e.g.* "Peoples and Problems of India." Many sidelights may also be obtained from the current numbers of the various reviews, especially "The Round Table," "International Review of Missions," "To-day and To-morrow," "Young Men of India," and the new magazine, "Outward Bound."

Members who wish further information should write to the Foreign Secretary at Headquarters, who will be glad to suggest lines for reading. He will also welcome comments and suggestions for improving these studies.

TURNBULL AND SPEARS, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH